

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Information and communication technology-based interventions for suicide prevention implemented in clinical settings: A scoping review protocol
AUTHORS	Shin, Hwayeon Danielle; Zaheer, Juveria; Rodak, Terri; Torous, John; Strudwick, Gillian

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Jessica Rassy Université de Sherbrooke
REVIEW RETURNED	01-Oct-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this very insightful manuscript. I believe this submission can make a significant contribution to BMJ as it provides a protocol that will allow a deeper understanding of information and communication technology-based interventions for suicide prevention implemented in a clinical setting. More specifically, this scoping review will identify and characterize the barriers and facilitators to implementing these ICT-based interventions as well as reported measures and outcomes.</p> <p>The abstract is clear and concise. The study design is pertinent and well justified regarding the research question.</p> <p>In the methods section, it would be interesting to announce the steps of the scoping review within the first paragraph to have a better overview of the project.</p> <p>In table 1, some criteria seem to be missing. For example, the exclusion of general use of electronic health care records, routine care provided via virtual platforms or telephones. Please review to make sure Table 1 includes all inclusion and exclusion criteria to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Regarding the exclusion of routine care provided via virtual platforms, can you elaborate on what is considered “routine care” vs use of ICT in routine care?</p> <p>Some interesting strengths and limitations are provided.</p> <p>The draft of data extraction tool is interesting and demonstrates a thorough reflection on the items to include. Is there a section on how the ICT is integrated into the clinical setting? This information could be helpful for the analysis, results and discussion.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Michelle Tye Black Dog Institute
REVIEW RETURNED	17-Nov-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the opportunity to review this protocol paper of a scoping review which will help elucidate barriers/enablers of the implementation of digital interventions for suicide prevention into clinical settings, and go on to inform the development and testing of implementation strategies. This paper is well written, with only a few minor typographical errors throughout, and I applaud the robust and well described systematic search methodology. My
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer Comments	Author Responses
<p>Reviewer: 1 Prof. Jessica Rassy, Université de Sherbrooke Comments to the Author: Thank you for the opportunity to review this very insightful manuscript. I believe this submission can make a significant contribution to BMJ as it provides a protocol that will allow a deeper understanding of information and communication technology-based interventions for suicide prevention implemented in a clinical setting. More specifically, this scoping review will identify and characterize the barriers and facilitators to implementing these ICT-based interventions as well as reported measures and outcomes.</p> <p>The abstract is clear and concise. The study design is pertinent and well justified regarding the research question.</p> <p>In the methods section, it would be interesting to announce the steps of the scoping review within the first paragraph to have a better overview of the project.</p> <p>In table 1, some criteria seem to be missing. For example, the exclusion of general use of electronic health care records, routine care provided via virtual platforms or telephones. Please review to make sure Table 1 includes all inclusion and exclusion criteria to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Regarding the exclusion of routine care provided via virtual platforms, can you elaborate on what is considered “routine care” vs use of ICT in routine care?</p> <p>Some interesting strengths and limitations are provided.</p>	<p>Thank you for your kind words and taking time to read this protocol and providing me with feedback. Your feedback will help strengthen the protocol.</p> <p>Thank you for the suggestion. I have added broad steps of the scoping review within the first paragraph of the methods section.</p> <p>(Lines 179-181)</p>

<p>The draft of data extraction tool is interesting and demonstrates a thorough reflection on the items to include. Is there a section on how the ICT is integrated into the clinical setting? This information could be helpful for the analysis, results and discussion.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. I added more detail (e.g., suicide prevention intervention category) on the Table 1.</p> <p>Thank you for the feedback. I agree, there needs to be clarification. Routine care means “care as usual” without intervention. I made this clarification in the main document. (Line 206)</p> <p>Thank you for pointing this out. I plan to extract implementation strategy(s) for ICTs. (Lines 279-280) I have updated the appendix (extraction tool) accordingly.</p>
<p>Reviewer: 2 Dr. Michelle Tye, Black Dog Institute Comments to the Author: Thank you for the opportunity to review this protocol paper of a scoping review which will help elucidate barriers/enablers of the implementation of digital interventions for suicide prevention into clinical settings, and go on to inform the development and testing of implementation strategies. This paper is well written, with only a few minor typographical errors throughout, and I applaud the robust and well described systematic search methodology. My</p>	<p>Thank you for taking time to read this protocol.</p>

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Jessica Rassy Université de Sherbrooke
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Jan-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for reviewing the manuscript and adding clarifications. I accept and recommend this revised version for publication
-------------------------	---